



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—GREEK AND LATIN ETYMOLOGIES.

I. THE BASE SĒP-/SŌP.

1) Lat. *sapit*: Gr. *ἐπει*, etc.

The Latin verb *sapit* means (1) 'tastes', (2) 'has taste, perceives'. Greek *ἄπτει* means 'fastens, binds' but *ἄπτειται* means 'grasps, touches'; cf. Lat. *stringit* (1) 'touches', (2) 'brings in touch, binds'. Further, *ἄπτειται* has the derived senses (3) 'perceives' (= 'grasps mentally') and (4) 'has sexual intercourse with'. In view of English *tastes* 'sapit, gustat' which is identical with German *tasten* 'tangere, tractare', both borrowed from older French *taster* 'to feel, taste' (cf. *tâte-vin*, 'wine taster'); and in view of Lat. *tangit* 'touches', but also specifically 'tastes, eats and drinks'; we may suspect the ultimate cognation of Gr. *ἄπτειται* 'touches' and Latin *sapit*, 'tastes'.

This brings us to a consideration of the Sanskrit verb *sāpati*, defined by Whitney in List of Verb-Roots, etc. by 'to serve'. But in fact *sāpati* seems almost to resist a single definition. The Vedic commentator Sāyaṇa defines *sāpati* by *स्पर्शति* 'touches', and the compound *ṛtasāpas*² (nom. plur.) 'keeping the ritus' is hardly to be felt as different from the compound *ṛta-sph̥ṇ̥sas* (nom. plur.). Supposing Sāyaṇa's definition of 'touches' to be correct — and it is borne out by the Avestan idiom *hafšī zastā* (= Sanskrit *sapasi hastena*) 'thou holdest (graspest, touchest) with thy hand', cited by Uhlenbeck (Etym. Woert. d. ai. Spr.)—*sāpati* invites comparison with *ἄπτειται* 'touches, grasps' (cf. Bartholomae, *air. Woert.* col. 1764), and with *sapit* 'grasps (mentally)'. Inasmuch, however, as *sāpati* is cognate with Homeric *ἐπει* 'tractat', the problem of correlating *ἄπτειται* with *ἐπει* presents itself for solution. It is unfortunate that *ἐπει* is as vague a word as *sāpati* and equally defies precise definition. But the cognation of *ἐπει* and *ἄπτειται* might be supposed to lie implicit in the following examples:

¹ Cf. Eng. *clever* 'sapiens', which seems etymologically to have meant 'grasping' (so the Oxford Dictionary): further note *mr̥ṣāti* 'touches; strokes; reflects'; *parimr̥ṣati*, 'grasps, seizes'.

² The only other compound in Sanskrit is *keta-sāpas* 'voluntatem-servantes'.

Σ 348 γάστρην τρίποδος πῦρ ἄμφεπε 'the flame began to touch the belly of the kettle on all sides'; T 392, ἵππους ἀμφιέποντε ζεύγνυσαν 'touching (seizing) the horses on both sides they hitched them up'. The compound *περιέπει* means 'touches gently' (= 'mulcet, tractat'), and *περιέπει τρηχέως* means 'mulcat' (= 'touches roughly').

From the noun *ὄπλα* (plur.), cognate with *ἔπει*, we may derive some light as regards the primary meaning of the latter: *ὄπλα* means 'tools, armour', and more specifically 'tackle—ropes, cordage'. As *tackle* is ultimately derived from old Norse *taka* 'to grasp, seize'—which belongs with Goth. *tēkan* 'to touch', Eng. *takes*—so *ὄπλα* may properly be derived from a root meaning 'to touch'.

Further, *ὄπλον* is used, according to Hesychius, of the membrum virile. Though this sense may be quite secondary, like the corresponding euphemistic use of Eng. *tool*, yet in view of Skr. *sāpas*, and Latin *sōpio*,¹ which exhibit the same meaning, to say nothing of Skr. *sāpāyant-* 'futuens', the presumption is that this sense was developed early: cf. also *ἄπτει* 'has sexual intercourse with', while *ψαύει*, *tangit* and *touches* sometimes verge on this sexual sense.

The vowel relations of *ἄπτει* and *ἔπει* constitute a difficulty, however, in the way of their cognation being recognized, unless we are to look on *ε* (*o*) and *a* as sub-varieties of *ɜ* (cf. Hirt, Griech. Gramm. § 109) in a long vowel series. For the long vowel series Latin *sōpio* might be cited, as well as *prō-sāpia* 'posterity' (cf. O. H. G. *fasel* 'young, posterity', M. H. G. *visel* 'membrum virile'). Latin supplies an additional attest of the long vowel series if *sēps*² (*sēpis*, *saepis*) 'hedge, fence, enclosure' be set down as a cognate of *ἄπτει* 'fastens, joins' (cf. German *festung* from *fest*, which Kluge in his *Woerterbuch* supposes to have meant originally 'fastened', whence 'firm').

There is no normal scheme of vocalisms, however, under which the *ē* of *sēps*, the *ō* of *sōpio*, and the *ā* of *prō-sāp-ia* can all fall, and it will be necessary to submit the *ā* of *prō-sāpia* to a special explanation as a secondary gradation to the *ǣ* of *sapit* and *ἄπτει*, which falls normally into place. Difficulty still confronts us from

¹ In Catullus 37.10 *sopionibus* (*scipionibus*, v. 1.) probably has this meaning.

² That this is the etymologically correct orthography, and not *saeps*, seems to me raised above all question by the compound noun *prae-sēpe* 'hut, hovel, manger'; similarly the verb compounds show *-saep-* or *-sep-*, never *-sēp-*. We might, however, write a base $\tilde{S}E(V)P-$.

Skr. *sāpati*, which might be explained from **sāpeti* with a secondary accent (cf. Wackernagel, ai. Gram. § 5), but not only is *a* from *ś* uncertain in Sanskrit (cf. Hirt, Ablaut § 15), but *sāpati* is doubtless identical with *ἄπει*, and must accordingly be derived from **sēpeti*. The alternatives are, accordingly, (1) to write the root as SEP-/SOP- 'to touch, bind, join', with long grades SEP-/SŌP- and a reduced grade SP-, explaining the *ā* (from *ə*) of *sāpit* and *ἄπει* as a secondary gradation to the long-vowel grades and the *ā* of *prō-sāpia* as a tertiary development from *ā* (*ə*); (2) to write the root as SĒP-/SŌP-/SĀP-, with secondary grades SEP-/SOP-/SP- (cf. analogous cases in Brugmann's Grundriss² § 549, c; and Reichelt in K. Z. 39, 14 sq.). A difficulty in either case is that Greek and Latin *ā* is nowhere matched by Sanskrit *i*, which renders the grade SĀP- problematical. Therefore, we may have to explain the *ā* (and *ā*) by some proethnic analogical interference. The root SĒP- 'touches, grasps' has a synonym in the Skr. root *āp-* 'to take', Lat. *apiscitur* 'takes' (cf. also the glosses *apicire* 'ligare' and *apio* 'ligo', which show the sense of *ἄπει* fastens);¹ and (*pro*)-*sāpia* 'progenies' invites, barring its *s-*, comparison with Skr. *āpi-s* 'friend', Gr. *ἡπιος* 'kind' (cf. the Eng. pair *kind* and *kin* 'genus'), supposing *ῆ* to be Ionic for *ā*.²

The Latin glosses define *sēps*, *sēpis* by *τάφρος, βόθρος*, a meaning further confirmed by the gloss *sepit* 'munit uel natans (lege uallans) uel penetrans': a *sēps* was then secondarily a 'pit' or 'ditch' as well as a hedge or enclosure. It is perhaps possible in this way, supposing the sense of 'pit' to have been proethnic, to connect *sēps* with *σπηλαιον* 'cave' (from SP-ĒS-, cf. Homeric *σπήεσσι*, dat. plur.), *σπέος* (stem SP-ES-ES), and Skr. *pas-tyām* 'habitation' (if for **s-pastyam*). It may also be that Skr. *pāsas*, *pas*, sexual organs of the male and female, respectively, Gr. *πίος*, Lat. *penis*,

¹ See Leo Meyer, Griech. Etym. I, p. 153.

² It is impossible to decide whether the *ē* of *coēpit* (Lucretius) is primitive, or merely analogical in Latin (see also Am. Jr. Phil. 26, 387 sq., where Skr. *√āp-* is derived from *Ē(Y)P-*). Here may be mentioned, *ἀπρόπος* of the assumption that in the primitive period SĒP- was affected by its synonym ĒP- (? ē), that in Latin **āpio* (inferred from *coēpio*), *cāpio* and *rāpio* all mean, with different degrees of intensity, 'I take'; and so does *sāpio* = 'I take, grasp (mentally)', under the assumption stated above. These words furnish a telling example of what Bréal has named *irradiation* (Sémantique, ch. III). For SEP-/ĒP- note Skr. *āpi-tvām* 'Bundesgenossenschaft': *sāpitvām* 'Gemeinschaft' (*pace* Bloomfield in JAOS. 16, 24 sq.: cf. particularly the native commentators there cited, p. 26). Query: should we recognize *s-* movable also before roots with vowel initial?

M. H. G. *visel* also attest a base s)P-ES-, cognate with the base of Skr. *sáras*, Lat. *sōrio*, Gr. *σπλον*. I note that in the Septuagint *σπήλαια* is a common designation for the *pudenda* (cf. Lat. *saltus*).

A difficulty remains in the aspirate of ἀφᾶ 'handles, feels' and ἀφάσσει 'takes hold of, handles, touches'. The instinctive feeling that ἄπτει and ἀφᾶ belong together is borne out even further by the fact that ἀφᾶ 'handles, feels' is used with the same class of objects as ἔπει 'fixes, arranges', cf. Z 321-2:

τὸν δ' εὖρ' ἐν θαλάμῳ περικαλλέα τεύχε' ἔποντα,
ἀσπίδα καὶ θώρακα, καὶ ἀγκύλα τόξ' ἀφώοντα.

It will, therefore, be necessary to explain the φ of ἀφᾶ as a special¹ Greek development. In view of the fact that ἄπτει means 'seizes, takes, wins', the forms ἡμμαι (found in compounds in both Iliad and Odyssey) and ἡφθην beside εἰλημμαι and ἐλήφθην, (: λαμβάνει 'takes,' wins') might well have resulted in the introduction of the φ of εἰληφα into forms of ἄπτει (cf. 2d aor. ἡφην).² Especial attention may be called to the rhyming pair ἀφύσσει and λαφύσσει; ἀφύσσει 'draws (wine, water,) — trahit' seems a specialisation of ἀφᾶ 'tractat', while λαφύσσει 'draws in, swallows greedily, quaffs' is a specialised sense of εἰληφα (cf. trahit pocula in Horace). The meaning 'draws, tears—quaffs' is exhibited in Greek by σπάει (i. e. σπ-ασ-ει, cf. the Homeric aorist σπάσσατο), which belongs ultimately to our root sĒP- 'to touch, take'.³

It remains to call attention to yet another Greek derivative of the root sep- 'to touch', viz: ἀπαλός 'soft'. For the signification cf. Gr. μαλακός 'soft': Lat. *mulcet* 'touches gently', *mulcat* 'touches roughly'; cf. also θιβρός, glossed by Hesychius with ἀπαλός, which will thus belong with θιγγάνει 'touches' (from a stem *dhig^w-ro-, cf. Lat. *frivere* | *figere*). Cognate with ἀπαλός, perhaps, is German *sacht* (with -cht for -ft, cf. Kluge's Woert., s. v.) 'soft'. Independent of the breathing, ἀπαλός may be explained from ĒP- (see Am. Jr. Phil. l. c.).

2) ἄνθρωπος.

In Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc. 25, vii fn. I made a suggestion in passing ("peripherisch") as follows: ἄνθρωπος 'human' from ἀνδρο

¹ Unless, resorting to determinatives, we write a base sĒ-BH-/sĒ-P-.

² The root-determinatives must have originated, in the main, from such rhyming assimilations.

³ Conversely German *ziehen* 'to draw' (: Latin *dūcere*) seems to have developed, when borrowed for use beyond the Rhine, the sense of 'to touch' (= Fr. *toucher*).

+ ϕ *ŋos* (: $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\omega$) 'possessing the nature of a man', where transfer of aspiration is to be recognized". This attempt to account for the θ seems to me not to have received the attention it deserved. What I had in mind was the possibility that the parasitic dental appearing as δ in $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega$ - was not so definitely a media as to exclude its aspiration: and I even fancied that the transfer of aspiration might have happened when $\delta\eta$ rather than θ was spoken by the Greeks. I based - ϕ *ŋos* on Skr. *vibhván* 'egregius', *ābhvas* 'unmenschlich', Lat. *superbus* 'uebermenschlich', cf. *ὑπερφίαλος* (Brugmann, Gr. Gram.³ § 24. 4). It might now be suggested that * $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\phi\omega$ s was an animal name in - $\phi\omega$ s (: BHĀ- 'to shine', cf. Prellwitz, B. B. 22, 76 sq., cited with approbation by Hirt, Gr. Gram. 284, c), and meant 'having the appearance of a man'. Semantically, it would make little difference whether we operate with - ϕ *ŋos* or - $\phi\omega$ s.

But a difficult phonetic question remains: how account for ω in * $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega$ - $\phi\omega$ s? A lengthened vowel in the first member of compounds is no stranger to Vedic Sanskrit, and Avestan and Greek parallels are found (cf. Wackernagel. ai. Gram. II, § 56). We might justify $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega$ - as we justify Skr. *rathā*-. Apter parallels are *virā-śāh*- "Männer beherrschend", *narā-śāh*sa- "der Männer Lob" (?). Note the nearly exact proportion Lat. *vir*: Skr. *virā*- = Skr. *nṛ*:- Skr. *narā*-. For $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega$ -, in view of Lat. *nerō-n*- 'manly', the question arises whether we have not to do with an δn - stem. Here, in my opinion, lies the solution. In the Veda, also, -*an*- stems exhibit \tilde{a} in compounds, e. g. *vibhṇā-sāh*- 'fortes-vincens', *vr̥ṣā-yūdh*- 'tauros-pugnans'. How are we to interpret this \tilde{a} ? Wackernagel (l. c., d.) especially denies to the \tilde{a} - of *an*-stems a proethnic character. In this I believe him to be wrong, and particularly on the score of Lat. *lenō-cinīum* 'procurer-wheeling', a compound I have treated at some length in Class. Rev. 18, 349. I there explained as *leno[ni-]cinīum*, but when I consider the type of *vibhṇā-sāh*-, *vr̥ṣā-yūdh*- and *vr̥ṣā-ravā-s* 'bull-screaming' (alongside of *vr̥ṣā-bharā-s* 'Männer-hegend') I can see no reason for denying to *lenō-cinīum* (alongside of *vaticinīum*) the character of a proethnic type of compound. The long vowel got into the compounds, I take it, from phrase-groups like *lenō canīt*; thus *lenō*- is, in fact, a nominative.

That the ω in * $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega$ - $\phi\omega$ s is to be connected with the \bar{o} of Lat. *nerō*—that both exhibit a nasal stem—is to a certain extent attested by $\epsilon\lambda\alpha$ - $\phi\omega$ s (with $a = \eta$, cf. Prellwitz, l. c. 100) and Lat. *colum-ba*.

As to accent, **ἄνδρω-φος* has the recessive accent of the *ḍāhu-vrihi* type, and that it falls on the *ā*- is no more—and no less—difficult than the accentuation *ἀνέρες*/*ἄνδρες*, *ἀνδράσι*/*ἄνδρεσσι*.

This explanation has a phonetic difficulty to acknowledge: how account for -θ- π- from <δ>- φ-? A form like Ionic *ἄχαντος* for *ἀκανθος* exhibits shift of aspiration, it is true, but a shift from aspirate (θ) to surd (κ) is not a warrant for the shift from aspirate (φ) to sonant (δ). So if we were to admit the derivation of *ἄνθρωπος* from **ανδρω-φος*, the phonetic problem is not attested by any parallel example; and, indeed, the fact that the sound -δ- inserted between -νρ- is parasitic renders the phonetic conditions unique. We must, therefore, feel a great reserve in regard to the derivation of *ἄνθρωπος* from **ανδρω-φος*.

A hardly less unique phonetic problem is presented in the explanation of *ἄνθρωπος* from **ανδρ-ῥωπος* (or **ανδρ-ῥοπος*) which was advanced by Brugmann in I. F. 12, 25. We cannot infer from *τέθριππον* out of **τετρ-ῥιππον* (?)¹ to *ἄνθρωπος* out of **ανδρ-ῥωπος*. The Attic form *μηθείς* from *μηδ' εἰς* with a probable intermediate stage **μήτ' εἰς* (cf. Brugmann Gr. Gr.³ § 139, e) is also not a real parallel to -θρ- from -δρῥ-.² Besides, the reconstruction of a Gr. **ώπος*/**όπος* 'face' (from a root *SEK^w* 'to see, say'), on the basis of Gothic *siuns* 'face', Lat. *signum*,³ O. Bulg. *sokü* 'accuser' must be accounted daring. In view of these reasons we must take an attitude of extreme reserve also to the derivation of *ἄνθρωπος* from *ανδρ-* + **ῥωπος*⁴ 'face, appearance'. This is particularly advisable in view of the fact that the compound **ανδρ-ῥωπος* is not the continuant of **NR-SŌPOS*, but must have originated in Greek after *sōpos* became **ῥωπος*.

¹ **τετρα-ιππον* seems to me the only correct writing, for *ι*- shows that we have not before us a continuant of *K^wETR- E^kWOM*; *τετρ'* from *τετρα-* by elision?

² I fancied I had found in Homeric *ποτολίεθρον*, which I was fain to derive from **ποτολι-ῥεδρο-* 'city-site', an analogy for the phonetic change Brugmann finds in *ἄνθρωπος*, but in view of *πέλλεθρον* 'acre of land', *ῥέεθρον* stream, *ῥεῖθρον* 'Stream-town', *κλθῆρον* 'bolt', the old explanation of -εθρον as suffixal seems to be valid.

³ On *signum* see below, No. 6.

⁴ Admitting **ώπος* we might compare **προσ-ῥωπον* 'mask' ('over the eyes') with Lat. *per-sōna* (-*sōna* from *SOK^w-SN-A*, cf. for the -*sn-* the Skr. stems *ak-ṣṇ-* 'eye', *cadkṣaṇa-* 'appearance'). Perhaps *persōna* comes from **pres-sona*, *pres-* being a by-form of *πρός* (cf. Aeolic *πρές*): it is not necessary to derive *προσ-* from *πρότι*, but it may well be either *PR-OS* or *PRO-S* (cf. Brugmann, *Kurze v. Gr.* § 610).

It is easy in moments of scientific exaltation to speak of the "Sirene des Gleichklanges", but rigid adherents to the doctrine of phonetic uniformity have found it hard to contemplate the disjunction of *ἄνθρωπος* from *ἀνδρ-* (cf. e. g. Brugmann, I. F. l. c.), especially because of the Hesychian gloss *δρώψ· ἄνθρωπος* (cf., e. g. Meillet, *Mém. de la Soc. de Ling.* 7. 166). So brief a gloss, without any usage in which *δρώψ* might betray a special sense, looks like a modern scientific etymology, to be sure; but we cannot make sure that *δρώψ*, if more fully defined, might not be seen to be cognate with *δρώπτης· πλανήτης, πτωχός, δρᾶπέτης· φυγᾶς*¹ (: Skr. *drāpayati* 'causes to run'). Perhaps also in the gloss *δρώψ· ἄνθρωπος* we are to recognize the debased sense of *ἄνθρωπος*, quasi 'servus': this would give us a reason for suspecting the ultimate cognation of *δρω-π-* with *δρηστήρ* 'servant' (cf. in Homer the forms *δρώοιμι, -δρώοσι* [cited by Leo Meyer, *op. cit.* III, p. 245] and the gloss *δρώοσι· διακονοῦσιν, ὑπηρετοῦσι*).

The positive suggestion I have to offer for *ἄνθρωπος* is a derivation from *ἄντρο-* + **ῶπος* 'cave-dwelling', 'specum pro sepe habens', basing **ῶπος* on Lat. *seps* 'hedge, *praesepe* 'hut, hovel', and comparing Skr. *ṛtasāpas* which, instead of rendering by "heiliges Werk pflegend", we might explain in terms of *ṛta-sād* "im heiligen Gesetze seinen Sitz habend." The English word 'keep' will render all the compounds fairly well, *ṛta-sāp-* 'keeping the *ṛta*', *ṛta-sād* 'keeping in the *ṛta*', **ἄντροῦπος* 'keeping in caverns'.

A point to which I attach some importance as a support of this explanation is the following: in Homer there are next to no examples of the singular of *ἄνθρωπος*, and the plural so markedly preponderates as to admit of our supposing that the *ἄνθρωποι* formed a community of 'cave-dwellers', to-wit.² In the same sense we might derive *δρώψ* from **δρφ-ῥωπ-* 'woods-dweller'.

As regards the definition of *ἄνθρωποι* by 'cave-dwellers', though well enough in line with archaeological facts—I refer to the cave-dwellings of early neolithic men, and note cases of historic survival like the *τρωγ(λ)οδύται* of Herodotus—it seems to me to have less to commend it than the earlier exposition as **ανδρω-φος*, in

¹ Cf. also (? with a formative *-p-*) *δρύπτην· ἀλήτην*, cognate with Skr. *ḍru-tās* 'running'; *δρυπολεῖ· ὀρεβιατεῖ, δρυπογέροντας· τοὺς ἀτόπους πρεσβύτας καὶ οἰονεῖ ἀτιμούς*.

² There is accordingly no inconsequence when Homer describes the dead in the islands of the blest as *ἄνθρωποι*.

spite of the clear phonetic difficulties involved therein. However, something yet may be urged in its favor on the semantic side, viz., the relation of Lat. *homo* 'human': *humus* 'earth', cf. *χθόνιοι* 'unterirdisch', which lets us surmise that *homo* meant not so much 'earthly, mortalis' as 'underground-dwellers': here note from the philosophical summary of Diogenes of Oinoanda (Rhein. Mus. 47, 440) the phrase οἱ ἀπὸ γῆς φύντες [*ἄνθρωποι*]. An address like "homines", to a population of "cave-dwellers" would be equivalent to "fellow-citizens".

On the other hand, *ἄντρο-* happens not to occur in the Iliad, and is of far from certain etymology. I can think of nothing so probable as that *ἄντρον* is etymologically cognate with Skr. *antár* (from ENTER), Lat. *inter* (from NTER) 'within', and belongs with Skr. *antrām*, Gr. *ἐντερον* 'entrails' (from ENT(E)RO-). I explain *ἀν-* as a contamination of *ἐν-* (EN-) + *ἀ-* (N-)—unless Osk. *antar* 'inter' vindicates a proethnic origin for the *a-* (but see Brugmann, Kurze v. Gr. § 594).

Postscript: Nazari, Riv. di Filol. 32, 94 posits **ἄνθρω-φρος* 'infrā-bus', antonym of 'superbus', noting for the sense *homo*: *humus*.

3) Κύκλωες.

(1) The Hesiodic Κύκλωες are lightning forgers; (2) the Homeric Κύκλωες inhabited caverns on mountain tops; (3) a last variety were wall-builders. The two last may well be one, assuming that the first walled-towns were built (about caves) on hill tops, as fortifications to take refuge in. If we transcribe Κύκλωες by Skr. **cakra-sāpas* and define by 'discus-grasping' (*cakrā-*, the discus of Viṣṇu) we get a most improbable sense for **κυκλο* + *ῥωπ-ες*, for Viṣṇu's discus and Zeus's thunderbolt do not invite identification (cf. the imperial Roman thunderbolt in Duruy, Histoire des Romains I, cxxiv). But **κυκλο* + *ῥωπ-ες*, 'wall-joining' yields a correct definition for *κυκλο-*, and accounts for **ῥωπ-ες* as a derivative to *SĒP-/SŌP-* (see above): in view of the recessive accent, however, Κύκλωες should be rendered by "rotundas-saepes-habentes." Of course, the mythical "round-eyed" is well enough if the myth is older than the name: but if the name is older than its explanation, then "round-sited" (wall-sited) has, by 'disease of language', become 'round-sighted' (? wall-eyed).

4) νῶροψ.

This adjective, usually defined by 'shining' or 'noisy', because it is always coupled with *χαλός*, may perhaps be better defined

by 'man-hedging, man-sheltering'. The definition is certainly apt, as χαλκός, with which it is always found, means 'protective armour', and it seems reasonable to derive from νωρ- 'man' (long-grade, corresponding to the grade exhibited by ἀγ-ήνωρ, or else from NĒ-) + ἡοπ- 'hedging, protecting'.

5) μέροψ.

In the Homeric phrase μέροπες ἄνθρωποι (βροτοί) the epithet μέροπες is very hard of definition. As a proper name Μέροψ was the name of a famous seer (Λ 329 = Β 831). An examination of the remaining usage yields the following result: (1) the term seemed especially allotted to city-dwellers, as in γ 217, πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων¹ (cf. Σ 288, 342, 490, γ 402)—cf. Euripides, Iphig. T. 1264; in Α 250 it is said that Nestor outlived two generations μερόπων ἀνθρώπων;² in I 340 the Atridae are asked if they alone μ. ἀ. love their wives; in Α 28 a rainbow is described as a portent unto μ. ἀ.; and in Β 285 Agamemnon is said likely to be rendered the most disgraced μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν; in ν 49 companies of soldiers are compared to μ. ἀ., while in ι 32 Penelope is said to yield respect rather to the worse of μ. ἀ. than to the better. After Homer μέροψ occurs in the 31st Homeric hymn (end) with the following context: ἐκ σέο δ' ἀρξάμενος κλήσω μερόπων γένος ἀνδρῶν³ | ἡμιθέων, ὃν ἔργα θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν ἔδειξαν, where I am disposed to interpret μερόπων γένος ἀνδρῶν by 'genus hominum optime merentium'. If we render μέροπες by 'optime merentes' it will not be inconsistent with the tragic usage of Aeschylus (Suppl. 88, Choeph. 1017) and Euripides (l. c.)

From all the passages one might infer one of two meanings, either (1) righteous or (2) civilized. For the first sense we may derive from μερ- (: μοῖρα 'destiny, fas'; μόρος 'destiny') + ἡοπ-, comparing again Skr. ṛta-sāp- 'right-keeping'. If the second definition, 'civilized', 'city-dwellers', be correct, we may derive from μερ- (: μείρεται 'divides') + *όπ- 'precinct' (cf. Lat. *sēp-s*): hence μέροπες ἄνθρωποι would mean 'men who divide their precincts'—those who had advanced from collective to something more like individual ownership (cf. the more individualized

¹ In the hymn to Apollo 42, the same phrase occurs, but Μερόπων is taken as a proper name = a tribe of Coans. Homer distinguishes the city of Cos as well-built.

² Cf. Hesiod, Frag. 172. 5.

³ Cf. Hesiod, Εργα, 109, χρύσειον μὲν πρῶτιστα γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων | ἀθάνατοι ποίησαν.

proprietorship described by Tacitus, Germ. 26, with the more collective system described by Caesar, B. G. VI. 22). The accent of μέροψ, if not secondarily shifted to conform to the rather large group of adjectives in -οπ- (cf. Leo Meyer, op. cit. I. 486), accords better with the second explanation.

There is a bird (the apiaster) that the Greeks called μέροψ. To what did he owe this name? Perhaps to his bright color (? from μερ-: Lat. *merus* 'bright' and -οπ- 'eye-spot'), but the curious notions recorded by Aristotle (H. A. 9. 13. 2; 6. 1. 6) and Pliny (N. H. 10. 98),—to the effect that the μέροψ (1) cared for his parents, who kept their nests; (2) that they nested alone in holes (ὀπαι),¹ in the ground, or deep in mud-banks beside rivers—make us suspect again that μέροψ meant either 'optime merens' or 'dividens-specūs'.

II.

6) Lat. *signum*: ἵχνος; *dignus*; ἱγνίς.

In Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc., vol. 26, p. liii (Special Session, 1894) I propounded two etymologies, in the following words, "*signum* 'statue, sign': *seco* 'cut' (cf. *sica* 'dagger') — *dignus* 'worthy': δεικνύμαι 'greet, honor'." I return to them now, ἀπρόσως of the question of the vowel-length before the group -gn-, as treated by Buck in the Classical Review, 15, 311 sq. Latin inscriptions attest *signum*,² *dignus* (and *ignis*), but the Romance languages attest vulgar (?) Latin *signo*-, *digno*-(or *signo*-, *digno*-?), nor can we say whether ī or i was the best Roman pronunciation in these words. The dialectal difference is habitually treated as Italic: it may have been inherited. At any rate, the root to which I have referred *signum* is, in its fullest form, to be written sē(y)-κ- (cf. Brugmann, Grundr. 2 § 549. c.); and the root of *dignus*: δεικνύται 'greet, honors' may also be written Dē(y)Ā- (so Brugmann, Gr. Gram.³ § 340, end); to these the proper -no- derivatives would be sαικ-νό-μ, δαϊĀ-νό-ς, i. e., Lat. *signum*, *dignus*. Lat. *signum*, *dignus* would

¹ If for *ὀπαι, then cognate with Lat. *sēp-s* 'βόθρος'.

² No conclusive evidence for an ī short by nature can be drawn from the diminutive *sigillum*, for what Vendryes (Intensité Initiale § 72) neatly terms the "loi de māmilla" need not be limited to consonant simplification: the Latin compound verb *conscribillo*, diminutive to *scribo*, seems a sure case for antepenultimate vowel-shortening before a stressed penultimate (*scribo*: σκαρίψος).

proceed normally from SEK-NO-M (SIK-NO-M), DEK̂-NO-S (DIK̂-NO-S), all of which are normal derivations from bases SĒ(Y)K- and DĒ(Y)K̂-. That 'cut, mark, form, sign' constitute a better definition for *signum* than anything to be got by the comparison with Lat. *inseque*, Goth. *saihvān* 'to see' (cf. Brugmann, *Kurze v. Gr.* § 309 d) seems to me to need no demonstration beyond a statement. There is no substantial semantic difference whether we derive *dignus* from the root of *δείκνυται* or from the root of *deceit* 'it becomes' (= "it honors"), for both, in my opinion, go back to the base DĒ(Y)K̂-.

With the derivation of *signum* from SĒYK-NÓM I couple the derivation of *ἵχνος* 'track' from SIK-SNOS-. For the specialisation of the original sense of 'cut, mark', we may note that while Ovid writes out *signa pedum* = 'tracks', Vergil uses a bare *signa* = 'tracks'. The Greek specialisation was as early as Homer, who uses *ἵχθυον* (which has the form, though not the accent, of a diminutive to *ἵχθυος*), in the *Odyssey* only, in the sense of track (cf. p 217, *ἵχθει*), cf. also Σ 321. In the other two *Iliad* uses we may find material available for etymology, to wit:

Ψ 764 ἵχλια τύπτε πόδεσσι πάρος κόνιν ἀμφιχυθῆναι,

where the use of *τύπτε*—even in this context—might justify the definition of *ἵχθυον* by τὸ *τυπτόν (cf. *signum* 'seal, statue' = *τύπος*);

N 71, ἵχλια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἡδὲ κνημῶν
ῥεῖ' ἔγων ἀπiónτος.

"For easily I knew the tokens of his feet and knees as he turned away" (Lang, Leaf, Myers' Translation). If we wanted to put it into Latin, I know nothing better for *tokens* than *signa*.

It is possible, also, that *ignis* brought a long *i* into Italic, if I am right in the conviction, long ago expressed (see Am. Jr. Phil. 17. 25), that account must be taken of *αἰγίς* and *αἰγλή* in settling the etymology of Skr. *agnis* and Lat. *ignis*, whose correlation I now effect by writing a base SĒ(Y)G-, *ib.*, 26, 401.

Postscript: Since the above essay was sent in for publication Walde's *Lateinisches Etymologisches Woerterbuch* has come to hand. It prompts the following note:

For the base SĒ(Y)-P-/SĒ(Y)-BH- (to combine the bases given on p. 307, fn. 2 and p. 309, fn. 1) we may cite Oscan *sīpus* (*i*) 'sciens' and O. Lat. (*per-*)*sibus* (with *i* in Walde, l. c., p. 463, but with *i*, *ib.* 544) 'callidus siue acutus'.

As to *signum*, it is only fair to note that the cognation with *secāre* was suggested first (I suppose) by Havet, *Mém. Soc. Ling.*, 6.35, and the explanation has been properly accepted by Stowasser in his *Woerterbuch*. The characteristic meaning of *signum* is statue, and the German word *Bildhauer* 'sculptor' should predispose a German to the correlation *signum*: *secare*. Further, the *i* of *signum* matches the *i* of *sīca*, and the root sĒY-K-, as given above.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

EDWIN W. FAY.